

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.

In compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1116(b)(1) and (b)(2), Applicants amend Claims 1, 8, and 14 to provide Claims with sufficient antecedent basis and to correct typographical errors, in order to present the rejected Claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

Appeal Brief

Applicants respectfully note that the instant Amendment and Response is filed contemporaneously with an Appeal Brief that addresses rejections presented in the Office Action mailed December 1, 2008 (hereinafter, "instant Office Action").

Claim Amendments

Applicants respectfully note that Claim 1 (Claims 8 and 14 include similar features) is amended herein to reflect the following:

A circuit for a memory module address bus comprising:
a transmission line comprising a series dampening impedance between a driver and a branch point of said transmission line; and
a parallel termination impedance having one end coupled to said transmission line between said series dampening impedance and said branch point, wherein said parallel termination impedance is on [[the]] a same side of any memory module as said driver;

said transmission line having branches from said branch point, wherein ones of said branches are coupled to at least one memory module interface.

The amendment made reflecting, “a transmission line comprising a series dampening impedance” was made to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the “said series dampening impedance” found later in the body of Claim 1.

The instant Office Action states:

Claims 1, 8 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the same side” on line 6 of claim 1 (lines 6-7 of claim 8 and line 7 of claim 14). For purposes of examination, the Examiner is interpreting the limitations to read as “a same side”. Appropriate correction is required.

(instant Office Action, page 4, Claim Objections section). Applicants respectfully submit that the “[a]ppropriate correction[s]” are made herein, and Claims 1, 8, and 14 recite, “a same side” instead of “the same side”.

Furthermore, the instant Office Action states, “Claims [sic] 14 is also objected to because of the following informalities: Replace ‘one the same side of’ on line 7 to ‘on a same side of’. Appropriate correction is required” (instant Office Action, page 4, Claim Objections section). Applicants respectfully submit that the “[a]ppropriate correction[s]” are made herein, and Claim 14 recites, “on a same side” instead of “one the same side of”.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing corrections are made to present the Claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

CONCLUSION

Based on the remarks and amendments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 1, 8, and 14 be amended as indicated herein.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 06/02/2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.

Registration No. 35,398

Wagner Blecher LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500